

## REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the arguments presented in the Office Action and respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks presented below.

Claims 18 and 22 have been amended, and claims 21 and 25 have been canceled. Thus, claims 18-20 and 22-24 are presently pending in the application.

Claims 21 and 22 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 18 and 22 respectively of copending Application No. 10/308,803. A terminal disclaimer executed by an authorized officer of the Assignee of the pending application is submitted herewith. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection is now moot and that it be withdrawn.

Claims 18-20 and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being incomplete for omitting essential elements. Claim 18 was combined with claim 21 to recite a cross-linking agent. Applicant respectfully submits that the requirements of section 112 are satisfied. Although the Examiner seems to suggest that a catalyst also be recited, Applicant respectfully traverses this suggestion. While a cross-linking agent may be incorporated into an elastomer, the nature of a catalyst is that while it assists the chemical reaction that forms the elastomer, it is not incorporated into the elastomer. Accordingly, Applicant does not believe that the catalyst is an essential element. Furthermore, it is well known that some cross-linking agents will cross-link without the need for a catalyst, although the reaction may be slow, and may be inefficient in terms of the amount of elastomer created from the base polymers or monomers.

Claims 18-24 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Applicants have amended the preamble of claim 18 to delete the phrase "high refractive index" and have positively recited the requirement that the elastomer of claim 18 have a refractive index of at least 1.43.

Claims 18 and 20-22 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tapsak et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,534,587. Claim 18 was amended to recite that the elastomer has a refractive index of at least 1.43, a limitation not taught or even suggested by Tapsak. For all of the above reasons, Applicant submits that claim 18, and the claims dependent therefrom, are patentable over the cited art, and respectfully request that they be allowed.

### **CONCLUSION**


Applicant has carefully reviewed the arguments presented in the Office Action and respectfully requests entry of the amendment and reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks presented above.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the above amendments and arguments, or any suggestions for further amending the claims to obtain allowance, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney, John Fitzgerald, at 310-242-2667.

Please charge any additional fees payable in connection with this Amendment to our Deposit Account No. 06-2425

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP

By:   
John K. Fitzgerald  
Registration No. 38,881

JKF:vmm  
Enclosures

Howard Hughes Center  
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90045  
Telephone: (310) 824-5555  
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696  
**Customer No. 24201**